



Fowler FBA, R. L. (2016). ἐκθορεῖν and the Derveni Papyrus.
Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik, 197(11), 17-27.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/43909970>

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the accepted author manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH at [http://www.habelt.de/index.php?id=27&tx_shpsystem_pi1\[journal\]=ZPE&tx_shpsystem_pi1\[mode\]=1&tx_shpsystem_pi1\[autor\]=Fowler,%20R.%20L.](http://www.habelt.de/index.php?id=27&tx_shpsystem_pi1[journal]=ZPE&tx_shpsystem_pi1[mode]=1&tx_shpsystem_pi1[autor]=Fowler,%20R.%20L.) . Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

The purpose of this article is, first, to point out additional evidence for the meaning of the verb ἐκθορεῖν in two passages of the Derveni papyrus (xiii 4 and xiv 1), and, secondly, to advance a novel hypothesis for the interpretation of columns xiii–xv, centering on the role of Kronos.

1. ἐκθορεῖν

At column xiii line 4 = *OF* 8 Bernabé the papyrus presents the text:

αἰδοῖον κατέπινεν, ὅς αἰθέρα ἔχθορε πρῶτος¹

Walter Burkert first suggested the translation ‘ejaculated’ for ἔχθορε, with αἰθέρα its object.² In support he cited Aischylos fr. 15 Radt, from Hesychios ̸814 Latte:

θρώσκων κνώδαλα· ἐκθορίζων καὶ σπερματίζων, γεννῶν. Αἰσχύλος Ἀμυμώνη.

The fragment has most recently been discussed by M.A. Santamaría, who notes that in this entry the three glossing verbs cannot be synonyms: one can engender (γεννῶν) beasts, but one cannot ejaculate (ἐκθορίζων, σπερματίζων) them; accordingly, he argues, we are not obliged by this entry to translate the word in the Derveni text as Burkert suggests.³ Burkert noted the similar phrase at xiv 1–2 ἐκθόρηι τὸ{ν} λαμπρότατόν τε [καὶ θε]ρμό[τ]ατον / χωρισθὲν ἂφ’ ἐωτοῦ, which he understands also to denote the ejaculation of the aither, here glossed as the ‘brightest and hottest part’.⁴ Santamaría responds that, even if θρώσκων can mean ‘ejaculate’, ἐκθρώσκω is not a synonym; it is extremely appropriate in contexts of birth, with the intransitive sense ‘leap forth’, of the offspring.⁵ Since, he argues, ἐκθρώσκω is used transitively in only one other passage of Greek literature, *AP* 9.371–2 (see below), it is much likelier that the verb is intransitive in xiv 1, and that τὸ λαμπρότατόν τε καὶ θερμότατον is the subject of the verb.

¹ Here and in what follows I omit underdots and brackets where there is no reasonable doubt of the reading, and follow Kouremenos, Parássoglou and Tsantsanoglou 2006 (= ‘KPT’) in imposing modern orthography (e.g. τὸν Κρόνον for τὸγ Κρόνον). I am grateful to Richard Janko for confirming some doubtful readings with the aid of recent high-quality photographs, and for his comments. I thank also Jan Bremmer for helpful suggestions, and am particularly grateful to Mirjam Engert Kotwick, who is preparing a commentary on the papyrus, for detailed discussion.

² Burkert 1987, 38 n. 57 = 2003, 61 n. 57; cf. Burkert 1999, 80–81 and 2005, 54–55 ~ 2006, 102–103. He is supported among others by Janko 2001, 24; further references in Santamaría 2012, 65.

³ Santamaría 2012, 65–66. Note also Hsch. ̸ 810 θρώσκει... ὀχεύει, ἔγκυον ποιεῖ, γεννᾷ. All of these meanings can work in Aisch. *Eum.* 660 τίκτει δ’ ὁ θρώσκων, which nicely illustrates the difficulty of using lexical entries to clarify the meaning of a lemma without the original supporting passages and their contexts.

⁴ Janko confirms that θε]ρμό[τ]ατον is certain as against λε]ρμό[τ]ατον in some editions.

⁵ See Bernabé’s apparatus for references.

To this, the reflexive ἐώντοῦ presents something of an obstacle. According to the standard rule, where the subject of the subordinate clause is different from the subject of the principal clause, a reflexive pronoun in the former can indeed refer to the subject of the latter; context determines the translation (Kühner-Gerth I 562). But τὸ λαμπρότατόν τε καὶ θερμότατον is modified by χωρισθέν, which must reinforce the sense of its being the subject (if that is what it is); one's first instinct therefore is to take the reflexive, which occurs immediately after χωρισθέν, as referring to that subject, but that produces a logical nonsense (how can 'it' be separated from itself and still be 'it'). A literal translation would have to run 'Kronos / Nous took this action [or some such principal clause] in order that the brightest and hottest element should leap out, separated from himself', which shows the problem. If the pronoun were meant to refer to the different subject of the principal clause, it would have been more natural to write ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.⁶

On the question of transitive vs. intransitive, there are at least three passages which provide good evidence that the verb can be used transitively. The passage from the *Anthology* (9.371–2) is not actually one of them. It runs:

Δίκτυον ἐκθρόσκοντα πολύπλοκον ἄρτι λαγῶν
σεῦε κύων θερμοῖς ἵχνεσιν ὠκυπόδην

Scaliger emended to δικτύου... πολυπλόκου, but that would be a *lectio faciliior*, and unnecessary. The addition of a preposition to an otherwise intransitive or reflexive verb often enables it to be constructed with the accusative; abundant examples can be found in the standard grammars (e.g. Kühner-Gerth I 300–301). Kouremenos, Parássoglou and Tsantsanoglou 2006, 198 in their note here quote Hdt. 5.104.2 ἐξελθόντα τὸ ἄστυ, 6.134.2 καταθρόσκοντα τὴν αἵμασίνην and 7.29.1 ἐξῆλθον τὴν χώραν (cf. Ferrari 2013, 61). We may be dealing with the same syntax in the Derveni papyrus; but if so, the meaning of ἔχθορε would have to be 'leapt from' or 'out of' (the aither), as it is in the *Anthology*. So although the passage may help elucidate the syntax, it does not really constitute an example of transitive ἐκθρόσκω.

The three passages offering the required support are the following. The first is the *Chaldaean Oracles* 14 des Places:

πατήρ φόβον οὐκ ἐνθρόσκει, πειθῶ δ' ἐπιχέει.

Michael Psellos, who quotes the line, glosses it by saying that God, being sweet and pacific, οὐ φόβον ἐμποιεῖ τοῖς ὑποκειμέναις φύσεσιν, ἀλλὰ πειθοῖ καὶ χάριτι πάντα ἐφέλκεται. The

⁶ Santamaría himself translates χωρισθέν ἀφ' ἐώντοῦ 'is separated from it'. The translation of KPT, 133 is even more problematic, as they retain τὸν: 'to spring out of the brightest and hottest one (masc.) having been separated from itself' (neuter); on p. 198 they explain the reflexive as 'denot[ing] the sameness of what separated and that from which it separated with respect to kind'; this at least acknowledges the difficulty, but is hardly a persuasive explanation. One should not accept such awkwardness if alternative explanations are available.

meaning is ‘implant’. The underlying transitive force of *θρώσκει* permits the inference that *έκθρώσκει* can be similarly used. This inference might already have been made for *έκθρώσκει* from the Hesychios entry for *θρώσκων*, but Santamaría’s argument is that, in the absence of an actual instance of transitive *έκθρώσκει*, one should not make such an assumption; it is, however, encouraging to find a transitive use of *ένθρώσκει*, which is closely analogous, merely substituting *έν-* for *έκ-*.

Secondly, at Oppian, *Cynegetica* 3.518 ff., we read of the hare:

έξοχα γάρ τόδε φύλον, ός’ άπλετος έτρεφεν αία,
 πουλυγόνον τελέθει· τό μέν άρ πόθι νηδύος έκτός
 έμβρυον έκθρώσκει τετελεσμένον, άλλο δ’ έσωθεν
 νόσφι τριχός φορέει, τό δ’ άρ’ ήμιτέλεστον άέξει,
 άλλο δ’ άναρθρον έχει θορόεν βρέφος ώπήσασθαι·
 έξειης τίκτει δέ, και ούποτε θήλυσ άναιδής
 λήθετο μαχλοσύνης.

Because of the usual intransitive force of the verb, one is first tempted to translate *έκθρώσκει* in 520 as ‘leap forth’, i.e. ‘is born’ (as translators have typically done).⁷ But as one reads further, one finds three successive clauses answering the *μέν* of 519, in all of which the mother hare is the subject; this leads one retrospectively to adjust one’s translation of the first verb to ‘causes to leap forth’ or ‘expels from’ the womb.

There is a clutch of parallels for this commonplace notion about hares (all cited by Mair in the apparatus of his Loeb edition), each displaying the same strong parallelism. Clearly some of these influenced the *Cynegetica*:

Hdt. 3.108.3: ό λαγός... πολύγονός έστι· επικυΐσκειται μοῦνον πάντων θηρίων, και τό μέν δασύ τών τέκνων έν τή γαστρί, τό δέ ψιλόν, τό δέ άρτι έν τήσι μήτρησι πλάσσεται, τό δέ άναιρέεται⁸

Xen. *Cyn.* 5.13: πολύγονον δ’ έστιν οὔτως ώστε τά μέν τέτοκε, τά δέ τίκτει, τά δέ κύει

Arist. *HA* 580a 1: ίσχει δ’ ό θήλεια γάλα πρότερον ή τεκεΐν, και τεκοῦσα εύθός οχεύεται, και συλλαμβάνει έτι θηλαζομένα

Eratosth. *Cat.* 34: μόνος δέ τών τετραπόδων δοκεΐ κύειν πλείονα, ών τά μέν τίκτει, τά δέ έχει έν τή κοιλία

⁷ Florence Chrestien (Paris 1575) translates ‘Car poussant de son ventre un petit qui est fait’, and Jacques Nicolas Belin de Ballu (Strasbourg 1787) has ‘Et tandis qu’elle fait sortir de son sein un petit tout formé’. All other translations I have checked render the verb intransitively: A. Salvini (Italian, 1728), J.G. Schneider (Latin, 1776), F.S. Lehrs (Latin, 1862), A.W. Mair (English, 1928), F. Pontani (Italian, 1997), L. L’Allier (French, 2009). I thank Bruce Gibson for kindly verifying L’Allier, and drawing my attention to Chrestien.

⁸ Quoted by Ath. 9 p. 400e.

Ael. NA 2.12: φέρει δὲ καὶ ἐν τῇ νηδύϊ τὰ μὲν ἡμιτελῆ, τὰ δὲ ὠδίνει, τὰ δὲ ἤδη οἱ τέτεκται

Plin. HN 8.219: *lepus... superfetat, aliud educans, aliud in utero pilis vestitum, aliud implume, aliud inchoatum gerens pariter*

Clem. Al. Paed. 2.10.88.1: ὀχεύεται δὲ καὶ τίκτει, τεκοῦσα δὲ εὐθὺς ὀχεύεται

Pollux 5.73: καὶ μὴν πολύγονόν ἐστιν... ὥστε τὸ μὲν ἤδη τέτεκται, τὸ δὲ μέλλει, τὸ δὲ κύεται, τὸ δ' ἔτι πλάττεται

The subject in these passages is normally the hare, but it can be the kitten (Pollux). The subject tends strongly to remain the same throughout the parallel structure. In the Herodotus passage, ἀναιρέεται is middle (cf. Hdt. 6.69.4); πλάσσεται is more likely to be passive (cf. Arist. GA 740a 36 (διαπλάττηται) and the passage of Pollux quoted below), though the middle seems possible. (The plural μήτρησι does not dictate a passive, i.e. as denoting a collective reference to the species; Herodotus uses plural for singular a few lines later, as frequently in the Hippocratic corpus.) If πλάσσεται is passive, the subject changes with ἀναιρέεται; but πλάσσεται rounds off the μὲν... δέ sequence, so this is not an exception to the tendency. In Aelian, however, the subject changes in the third colon. A tendency is not a rule, and obviously there is nothing to prevent an individual author from varying an established pattern. The author of the *Cynegetica*, as it happens, is inordinately fond of parallelism, so changing the subject would not be in his style. Moreover, the parallelism of ἐκθρόσκει τετελεσμένον / ἡμιτέλεστον ἀέξει militates against reading the δέ following ἄλλο in 520 as marking a change of subject. I conclude that the subject is the hare throughout, and ἐκθρόσκει is transitive.

The first passage was helpfully theological, and the second one helpfully biological. The third witness, a passage in ps.-Plutarch *De fluv.* 23.4 p. 1165A, is both:

Μίθρας υἱὸν ἔχειν βουλόμενος καὶ τὸ τῶν γυναικῶν γένος μισῶν πέτρα τινὶ προσεξέθορεν· ἔγκυος δὲ ὁ λίθος γενόμενος....

This cannot mean ‘mounted a rock’, since such a translation ignores the -εξ-; the word must mean ‘ejaculated onto’, and the simplex ἐξέθορεν accordingly means ‘ejaculated’. There are, moreover, some highly suggestive parallels for this passage, which link directly to the Bronze Age background to Hesiodic and Orphic theogonies alike. These cannot prove anything about the use of the Greek verb, but the survival of a mythological motif is significant, and will be of interest in the next section. In the Hurrian/Hittite succession myth, the storm-god Teššub has intercourse with a rock and engenders the monster Ullikummi.⁹ The crucial verb is lost in a lacuna; Güterbock 1951, 149 translates ‘and into her his manhood [flowed]’, but the noun could be accusative, and one could supplement something like ‘and onto her he [emitted] his

⁹ Discussion of these passages in Burkert 1979 = 2003, 87–95 (who correctly translates ps.-Plut. ‘ergoß seinen Samen auf einen Felsen’). For the text see Güterbock 1951; *ANET* 121–125; further references in West 1997, 103 n. 121.

manhood'.¹⁰ The motif of ejaculating on a stone recurs in the story of the birth of Attis according to one Timotheus, generally taken to be the Eumolpid priest of the early third century BC, as related by Arnobius, *Adversus Nationes* 5.5. The story begins with Zeus' frustrated attempts to have intercourse with the Magna Mater; subsequently, *voluptatem in lapidem fudit victus. hinc petra concepit....*. Pausanias' related version (7.17.10) has Δία.... ἀφεῖναι σπέρμα ἐς γῆν; the setting is Pessinous, in the heart of Phrygia. The story of Hephaistos, frustrated in his attempt on Athena, ejaculating onto the earth is a distant descendant of this ancient tale. So too is the second birth of Aphrodite in the Orphic Rhapsodic theogony, in which Zeus, unable it seems to consummate his desire for Dione, ejaculates instead into the sea (*OF* 183.1–2 = 260 F Bernabé): ἀπὸ δ' ἔκθορε... αἰδοίων ἀφροῖο γονή. Here the verb is intransitive; but it is clear from the other passages that the verb can also be used transitively.

2. Kronos

Transitive 'ejaculate(d)' is thus a perfectly possible translation of ἐκθορεῖν in both xiii 4 and xiv 1. That it is possible does not mean it is necessary; nor is it necessary that the reference be to the same act, and the translation be the same, in both passages. The presence of the verb in the text before the commentator, and perhaps in other texts known to him, might have encouraged him to use the same verb of another event in the poem, perhaps in order to emphasise some conceptual link between the two passages as he understood them. The Orphic author too might have used the word twice in different senses; at xxi 1, whatever the right reading, a similar word occurs, showing a predilection for this root.¹¹ Thus, the first passage could mean 'who first leapt from the aither' while the second passage could refer to some act of expulsion, whether ejaculation or something else. Other combinations are possible; decision must depend on analysis of the passages.

I reproduce the relevant columns after Kouremenos, Parássoglou and Tsantsanoglou 2006, consulting also Bernabé 2007a:

xiii

- “Ζεὺς μὲν ἐπεὶ δὴ πατρὸς ἐοῦ πάρα θέσφατ' ἀκούσας”·
οὔτε γὰρ τότε¹² ἤκουσεν, ἀλλὰ δεδήλωται ὅπως
ἤκουσεν, οὔτε ἡ νύξ κελεύει. ἀλλὰ δηλοῖ ὧδε λέγων·
“αἰδοῖον κατέπινεν, ὃς αἰθέρα ἔκθορε πρῶτος”·
5 ὅτι μὲν πᾶσαν τὴν πόησιν περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων
αἰνίζεται καθ' ἕπος ἕκαστον ἀνάγκη λέγειν.
ἐν τοῖς αἰδοίοις ὁρῶν τὴν γένεσιν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους
νομίζοντας εἶναι τούτῳ ἐχρήσατο, ἄνευ δὲ τῶν
αἰδοίων οὐ γίνεσθαι, αἰδοίῳ εἰκάσας τὸν ἥλιον·

¹⁰ Ian Rutherford, to whom I am grateful for help in Hittite matters, confirms that this is possible.

¹¹ Editors variously read θόρνῃ, θορνῇ, θόρ{v}ῃ, θορν<ύ>ῃ, θορ{v}ῇ (see Bernabé's apparatus); the exegesis works with the verb θόρνυσθαι.

¹² Janko (above, n. 1) confirms that τότε is certain as against τόδε.

- 10 ἄνευ [γὰρ τοῦ ἡ]λ[ί]ου τὰ ὄντα τοιαῦτα οὐχ οἶόν [τε
 γίν[εσθαι]ένων τῶν ἐόντων [
 πρ[¹³] τὸν ἥλιον πάντα ὁμ[οίως
]οὐδ' ἐοῦσ[ιν] οὐ
] περιέχειν [
]. [

— — —

xiv

- ἐκθόρῃ τὸ{ν} λαμπρότατόν τε [καὶ θε]ρμό[τ]ατον
 χωρισθὲν ἀφ' ἐωυτοῦ. τοῦτον οὖν τὸν Κρόνον
 γενέσθαι φησὶν ἐκ τοῦ Ἥλιου τῇ Γῇ, ὅτι αἰτίαν ἔσχε
 διὰ τὸν ἥλιον κρούεσθαι πρὸς ἄλληλα.
 5 διὰ τοῦτο λέγει “ὃς μέγ' ἔρεξεν”. τὸ δ' ἐπὶ τούτῳ·
 “Οὐρανὸς Εὐφρονίδης, ὃς πρώτιστος βασίλευσεν”.
 κρούοντα τὸν Νοῦν πρὸς ἄλληλα Κρόνον ὀνομάσας
 μέγα ῥέξαι φησὶ τὸν Οὐρανόν· ἀφαιρεθῆναι γὰρ
 τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτόν. Κρόνον δὲ ὠνόμασεν ἀπὸ τοῦ
 10 ἔργου αὐτόν καὶ τᾶλλα κατὰ τ[ὸν αὐτὸν λ]όγον.
 τῶν ἐόντων γὰρ ἀπάντων [οὐ]πω κρουομέ[ν]ων
 ὁ Νοῦς] ὥς ὀρ[ί]ζω]ν φύσιν [τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν ἔσχε]ν
 Οὐρανός].¹⁴ ἀφαιρεῖσθαι δ' αὐ[τόν] φησι τὴν βασιλ[είαν]
 κρουο]μένων τ[ῶν] ἐ[ό]ντων] . ντα

— — —

xv

- κρούε<ι>ν αὐτὰ πρὸς ἄλληλα κα[ὶ] ποιήσῃ τὸ [πρῶτ]ον¹⁵
 χωρισθέντα διαστήναι δίχ' ἀλλήλων τὰ ἐόντα·
 χωριζομένου γὰρ τοῦ ἡλίου καὶ ἀπολαμβομένου
 ἐν μέσῳ πῆξας ἴσχει καὶ τᾶνωθε τοῦ ἡλίου
 5 καὶ τὰ κάτωθεν. ἐχόμενον δὲ ἔπος·
 “ἐκ τοῦ δὴ Κρόνος αὐτίς, ἔπειτα δὲ μητίετα Ζεὺς”·
 λέγει τι ‘ἐκ τοῦδε ἀρχή ἐστιν, ἐξ ὅσου βασιλεύει ἡδε
 ἀρχή’· διηγεῖται Ν[οῦς τ]ὰ ὄντα κρούων πρὸς ἄλληλα
 διαστήσας τε [πρὸς τῇ]ν νῦν μετάστασιν οὐκ ἐξ ἐτέρων

¹³ Janko (above, n. 1) confirms the reading here.

¹⁴ Restoration of 11–13 very uncertain; see below.

¹⁵ κᾶ[μ] ποιήσῃ τὸ[ν ἥλι]ον Betegh, translating ‘and, if he made the sun separate, (the result is that) the things which are stood apart from one another’ (see Betegh 2004, 32, 233). Janko 2002, 30 points out that κῆμ would be expected (cf. xxiv 5) and confirms from photographs (above, n. 1) that there is insufficient room for μ. At the end of the line Burkert *apud* Rusten 1985, 137 supplemented τὸ [λοιπ]όν.

10 ἕτερ' ἀλλ' ἔτε[ροῖα ποιεῖν.]
 τὸ δ' "ἔπειτα [δὲ μητίετα Ζε]ύς"· ὅτι μὲν οὐχ ἕτερος
 ἀλλὰ ὁ αὐ[τὸς δῆλον· σημαίν]ει δὲ [τ]όδε·
 "μῆτιν κα [c. 13]εν βασιληίδα τιμήν
 ες []αι ἵνας ἀπ []
 15 εἰ[]

xvi

πρῶτ]ον¹⁶ τὸν ἥλιον ἔφησεν εἶναι δεδήλωται· ὅτι δὲ
 ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων τὰ νῦν ὄντα γίνεται λέγει·
 "πρωτογόνου βασιλέως αἰδοίου· τῷ δ' ἄρα πάντες
 ἀθάνατοι προσέφυν μάκαρες θεοὶ ἡδὲ θέαιναι
 5 καὶ ποταμοὶ καὶ κρῆναι ἐπήρατοι ἄλλα τε πάντα,
 ὅσσα τότε ἦν γεγαῶτ', αὐτὸς δ' ἄρα μοῦνος ἔγεντο".
 ἐν τούτοις σημαίνει ὅτι τὰ ὄντα ὑπῆρχεν αἰεί, τὰ δὲ
 νῦν ὄντα ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων γίνεται.

Let us begin with col. xiv, and relatively uncontroversial matters. In 1 ff., assuming a transitive meaning for ἐκθόρηι, someone or something is ejaculating or expelling the 'brightest and hottest' element so that it is separated from himself or itself. That the thing expelled is the sun is clear from the sequel.¹⁷ Further references to the sun and things being knocked together come in column xv. At the beginning of column xvi, as Schröder 2007 noted, the construction implies a preceding ὅτι μὲν, so that the commentator is here moving on to a new point; and what follows is indeed a new topic. Columns xiii.4–xv are thus taken up with explaining how the sun is responsible for primeval generation, because owing to his heat things get knocked together; in xvi the commentator goes on to explain that the present order of things emerged from this primeval order (the point there is that things that are now came out of things that were before, xvi 2; the dividing line between then and now was the great event of Zeus swallowing all that preceded). Although the restoration of xiv 11 ff. must be speculative because of the lacunae, the general sense seems to be that, in the time of Ouranos, things were still mixed together in an undifferentiated mass, so that generation could not occur. Ouranos indeed set the stage for subsequent generation by defining φύσις (if the attractive, but highly uncertain, restoration of xiv 12 is correct), but it was only when Kronos castrated him that generation could occur, since, according to our commentator, this

¹⁶ Schröder 2007 argues persuasively that αἰδοῖ]ον cannot be the right supplement here; his suggestion αἴτι]ον is, however, too short for the space, as one can see by comparing xiv 3 and the photographs in KTP, whereas πρῶτ]ον fits exactly like πρωτογόνου two lines below. My suggestion would allow something like ὅτι μὲν οὖν αἴτιον τοῦ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα γενέσθαι τὸ / πρῶτ]ον κτλ.

¹⁷ Santamaría 2006, 66 after Ferella 2008, 196 notes that the same words describe the sun in Empedokles *Vors.* 31 B 21.3 and Herakleitos 22 A 1.

was when the sun became a separate entity and acquired its position in the sky.¹⁸ The etymology of Kronos is κρούειν plus Νοῦς; our commentator argues that Νοῦς was there all along, manifesting itself successively as Ouranos, Kronos and Zeus.

It is convenient to organise further discussion around the identity of reference, or otherwise, of xiii 4 and xiv 1. First, if they both refer to the same act, several problems arise, which have as yet yielded no agreed solution. If Ouranos is subject in both places, the problem is that the commentator has equated the aither in xiii with the sun in xiv, which is a very odd thing to do. Throughout the preserved text of this section of commentary, i.e. xiii 5 – xv, only the sun is in view, not the aither; at xv 3 it is unambiguously the sun that is separated. Possibly, having explained in the missing part of column xiii how the sun emerged from the aither, the commentator felt free to speak henceforth of the sun being separated from Ouranos, omitting the intermediate step; but this reconstruction is hardly less awkward. It is also hard, on this understanding, to see how the castration fits into the picture; Ouranos' ejaculation of the aither (from which the sun emerged) is not the same as the severance of the phallus (which is the sun). Indeed, the sequence of thought from xiii 5 to xiv 1 on this reading is quite obscure: Ouranos ejaculates the aither; his phallus is the sun; without the sun generation cannot occur; reference again to ejaculation of *aither* in xiv 1; thus, by castrating Ouranos, and because of what he did with the sun, Kronos got his name. It is hard to see how this sequence can be restated into a coherent argument.

If we abandon the view that xiii 4 and xiv 1 refer to the same action, other possibilities emerge, but problems remain. If xiv 1 is understood to refer to the castration of Ouranos, the problem is to determine the subject of ἐκθόρηι. Ouranos can hardly be referring to his own castration. If Zeus is the subject, and he is expelling the phallus after having previously swallowed it, this is the second stage of creation, but the sequel in xiv shows that we are still in the first.¹⁹ If Nous (or Aer) is the subject, one understands that Nous has caused the 'brightest and hottest' to be separated from himself by engineering the castration. Because Nous is the underlying identity of all the gods, the author can use the reflexive pronoun, even if Kronos is the named agent of the castration in the narrative. This makes better immediate

¹⁸ In xv 3–4 I accept Betegh's arguments (2004, 242) for taking ἐν μέσῳι with ἀπολαμβομένου rather than πῆξας, but resist his translation of the latter word as 'coagulated' ('as the sun got separated and encircled, he coagulated and held fast both the things that are above and those which are below the sun'), in spite of the parallel of συμπαγῆναι in ix 8 (see his arguments at 230–234, 252–257). The point here is that the sun, now created and appropriately placed, causes the right kind of coming together; πῆξας ἴσχει refers to the firm physical placing of other matter once the sun had assumed its central position, so that this process could continue indefinitely. I do not follow his further argument (235, 265) that 'separated' refers to the castration while 'encircled' refers to Zeus' swallowing the phallus; this whole section is about Kronos. Some translators suppose that a verb of prevention preceded κρούειν (e.g. KPT 134), so that Nous/Kronos is preventing things from knocking together, but this is precisely backwards; things must be separated, and be kept separated, in order to be able to knock together and procreate. With too much heat, everything is melted together; with too little, things are too sluggish to come together and procreate. This comes about when the sun, and the things above and below it, are firmly in their proper place.

¹⁹ In spite of xv 9 τῇν νῦν μετέστασιν; the first phase was replicated in the second, and the commentator here is stressing the continuity, as suits his general argument.

sense of the syntax: in the narrative, Kronos caused the phallus to be separated from Ouranos, but in the exegesis, Nous (who is both Ouranos and Kronos) caused the phallus to be separated from itself. This reading also allows an easier continuation to xiv 2 ff., where Kronos is the subject. It is not free of problems, however. A minor one, perhaps, is that ‘leap forth’ is not the most obvious verb for the trajectory of a severed phallus. More seriously, in xiv 2, when the commentator writes ‘this “Kronos,”²⁰ then, he says is born from the Sun to the Earth, because through the sun things had a reason to be knocked together’,²¹ it rather implies that he has just been glossing a text in which both phallus and sun figure, and are related to one another, and that the sun is not merely by the commentator’s allegorical insertion.²² With both sun and phallus in the text, the statements that Kronos was ‘son of the Sun’ and that he is responsible for what the sun does become easier to understand: he is son of Ouranos by way of the same phallus that became the sun because of his doing. I agree that the presence of both sun and phallus is implied by the commentator’s remarks; but if so, how exactly, after the act of castration, did the phallus become the sun? Spontaneous metamorphosis, it would seem. This has been proposed, but it is very odd.²³ In support, one might appeal to myths of astral metamorphosis of humans, which were common already in archaic Greece; yet these do not seem a sufficient parallel, even if allowance must be made for the unorthodox nature of this text. Deities in Greek myth ought to be persons with parents of some kind, not transformed phalli. The suggestion has the desperate air of a problem of an interpretation’s own making.

Finally, yet more problems confront the view that Zeus swallowed the phallus, however one understands the relation of xiii 4 to xiv 1. Firstly, if the sequence of events is that Kronos first severed the phallus of Ouranos, which was later swallowed by Zeus, the meaning of xvi 3 ff. must be that all previous creation (ὅσσα τότε ἦν γεγαῶτα) clung to (προσέφυν) the phallus, which entails the weird idea that Ouranos clung to his own phallus. Not impossible, perhaps, but the oddity ought to be acknowledged; it is certainly easier to imagine that the whole of previous creation was regarded by the poet as a growth upon Ouranos, which/who was swallowed entire.

Secondly, what happened to the portentous member after Ouranos was unmanned? Was it merely lying idly about, or wandering aimlessly in the sky, until Zeus swallowed it? This too has been proposed, but the idea is no less strange than metamorphosis.²⁴ The economy of

²⁰ I.e. ‘Kronos as I understand him’; for τοῦτον effectively placing quotation marks around its noun see the examples at Kühner-Gerth I 645. That Kronos was born from Ouranos in the underlying poem is clear from xiv 6, perhaps followed immediately by xv 6.

²¹ For the translation see Schröder 2007. τὰ ἐόντα is the unstated subject, as in xiv 7. As Schröder notes, a translation such as ‘Kronos was responsible for things being knocked together because of the sun’ implies the articular infinitive τοῦ κρούεσθαι.

²² Betegh 2011, 223 well notes that interpretation would be eased if the phallus and the sun ‘got assimilated, explicitly or implicitly, already in the poem, or at least it was an obvious and relatively widespread interpretation’. Similarly Bernabé 2007b, 81.

²³ See e.g. Brisson 2003, 28, Betegh 2004, 122, 171 for the problem; also Betegh 2011, 223. Brisson 2003 and Calame 2008, 858 favour metamorphosis.

²⁴ Bernabé 2002, 111 and 2010, 71.

Greek myths, and the potency of the Sky-god's member, suggest that something should happen instantly. In the two other known myths involving severed phalli, the sequel is told immediately: in Hesiod's *Theogony*, the phallus falls into the sea and engenders Aphrodite; in the myth of Attis, the severed phallus engenders an almond tree, whose fruit causes the impregnation of Attis' mother (Paus. 7.17.11).

These difficulties prompt one to think that a solution may lie in an altogether different quarter. Kronos is the subject of the exegesis in xiv 2 ff.; if our papyrus had begun at xiv 1, and we had nothing else, it would probably have been suggested before now that Kronos is the subject of ἐκθόρηι, and thus the one who makes the 'brightest and hottest' leap out of himself. This observation in turn suggests a bold hypothesis, which has the advantage of removing all of the difficulties mentioned above, but the obvious disadvantage of being speculative. Let us see where it leads nonetheless.²⁵

If Kronos is ejecting this element from himself, it follows that he has previously ingested it. Scholars who interpret αἰδοῖον in xiii 4 as 'phallus' note the parallel with the Anatolian succession myth that is in the background to Hesiod's *theogony*. In this myth, Kumarbi does not castrate Anu with a knife, but bites off his phallus and swallows it; becoming pregnant as a result, he gives birth to three gods including the equivalent of Zeus. Kumarbi is the equivalent of Kronos.²⁶ On the view that in the Orphic *theogony* Zeus swallowed the phallus of Ouranos or Protogonos, one would say that the motif has been transferred to him; on this alternative proposal, the motif stays with Kronos in the first instance.²⁷ After swallowing the phallus (in the lost part of col. xiii), he subsequently became pregnant and gave birth to the sun. It is this action to which xiv 1 refers. The expulsion could have occurred by giving birth in some manner, e.g. from mouth (as Kronos gives birth to his children in Hesiod), split head or belly; these seem to be in play for Kumarbi, though the text is fragmentary.²⁸ Ejaculation would also be a possible method; we noted at the end of the first section that this is an established motif in Bronze Age Anatolian myth, although admittedly it is not a fully-formed deity or divine element that is ejaculated in these stories. Burkert has noted a parallel in Egyptian myth, in which Shu, the aither, is thus created.²⁹

Of course, such a myth of Kronos is attested nowhere else in the Greek tradition. But then, neither is the myth of Zeus swallowing the phallus, if that is how the Derveni *theogony* had it. Commentators suppose that the Zeus myth has been bowdlerized in later Orphic texts,

²⁵ 'Boldness in speculation is a quality that critics will find in most of my work' (West 2013, 487).

²⁶ For the text and myth see Güterbock 1948; *ANET* 120–121; West 1997, 103 n. 120, 278–279; Beckmann 2011.

²⁷ If in the Derveni papyrus Zeus swallowed the whole god and not just the phallus, one might suppose that his action was inspired by the episode of Metis in Hesiod rather than directly by the Hittite story.

²⁸ According to Beckmann 2011, Kumarbi spits out some of the semen onto Mt Kanzura, and Tašmišu / Šuwaliyat is born; Tessub / Muwatalla is subsequently born from Kumarbi's skull, a forerunner of the Athena myth; the manner of the third birth is uncertain.

²⁹ Burkert 2005, 55 ~ 2006, 103.

which make him swallow Phanes whole.³⁰ On this alternative proposal, the myth in the later texts has also been bowdlerized, but by reversion to the standard Hesiodic myth of castration with a knife. It may be admitted too that this parentage for Helios is unattested elsewhere, and was, on this reading, dropped from the later tradition in favour of the usual genealogy. One can respond that in Greek mythology Kronos is, at least, father of Hyperion, who is a stand-in for the Sun created to provide a common ancestor for Helios, Selene and Eos. Moreover, it is notable that the Sun is more prominent in Orphism than in standard Greek religion already in the fifth century, as attested in the *Bassarids* of Aeschylus, in which Orpheus glorifies the Sun, equated with Apollo, as the greatest of gods (*OF* 536 T Bernabé; see also *fr.* 537–545 for the Orphic cult of the Sun). In the Derveni text, the sun is in fact the keystone of the cosmology, as one sees not only in these columns but in columns ix and xxv. Such an important deity might well have a special genealogy. That the Sun was a more prominent deity in the Hurrian/Hittite pantheon than in the Greek is also helpful for our purposes. The Sun (Istanu) is not (alas) son of Kumarbi in the Hittite text; the identity of the father is not actually known, but he cannot be Kumarbi, since the Sun-god is already contemplating the scene during Kumarbi's pregnancy in col. ii of the relevant text.³¹

The advantages of making this assumption are several. (1) The confusion of aither and sun is eliminated; xiii 5 ff. is about nothing but the sun and the phallus of Ouranos. (2) The syntax of xiv 1 is straightforward. Nous is the probable subject, along the lines suggested above: he arranged matters in this way so that the brightest and hottest element should be separated from himself, and become the sun. (3) One can see how both the literal and allegorical meanings of the myth fit in with what the commentator is saying. Both sun and phallus are in the text, or perhaps in the underlying myth (to the extent that the myth was not fully articulated in the poem and merely referred to by the commentator).³² In explaining αἰδοῖον in xiii 4, the commentator is not introducing the extraneous idea of a phallus into the text;³³ it was already there. The posited myth allows him to say, in the manner of this kind of exegesis, that the poet has made use of this image (αἰδοῖωι εἰκάσας τὸν ἥλιον, xiii 9); that is, the poet has included this story about the phallus for the sake of the unwise, so that they may understand the power of the sun (it is 'likened to' an organ of generation, as the commentator sees it, whereas the poet said that it was, or rather became, the sun). (4) The phallus is not

³⁰ Betegh 2004, 120 n. 77. Burkert 1999, 81–82 pointed out a passage in Diogenes Laertius (proem. 5), which implies that Orpheus attributed the act of fellatio to the gods; he argues that this may be a reference to the myth in the Derveni papyrus. On my proposal it could refer to Kronos' action.

³¹ Ian Rutherford notes that the place of the sun in Hittite myth is complicated; in Hurrian myth, from which this text is adapted, the Sun-god is male, whereas for the Hittites the sun was female, consort of the Storm-god. In Mesopotamian myth the Sun-god is son of the Storm-god.

³² As many scholars have noted, this is not a systematic line-by-line commentary in the manner of modern works. Our author's purpose is to expound doctrine as instantiated not only in this text but in Orphic tradition generally. He does not follow the order of the text, and is not obliged to quote it in its entirety. He is doubtless an initiate himself (Janko 2001, 5; West 1983, 81), and may refer in the course of advancing his arguments to myths or other texts which were used by Orphics, to which his text may make only allusive reference.

³³ Betegh 2004, 121 and Bernabé 2007b, 81 note this as a difficulty to be explained, if xiii 4 does not refer to a phallus. I do not think it does so refer, but the phallus of the theogony is needed to understand the sequence of thought at xiii 4 ff. (see below).

obliged to wait untold millennia to fulfil its destiny. As expected, it engenders a birth immediately, not by unparalleled metamorphosis but by a kind of parentage familiar from Hesiod's *Theogony*. There, of course, Kronos swallows and regurgitates his children, but the birth of Athena is also relevant, since we have a transformation (of Metis to Athena) inside Zeus's belly. (5) The route from the Hurrian/Hittite myth is more direct; Kumarbi's action is passed on without change to Kronos.

These seem to me considerable advantages, but in the absence of further evidence the proposal can be only a theoretical possibility. It is useful, nonetheless, to bear in mind just how severe are the difficulties facing other readings on offer. When all solutions on offer raise serious problems, one has to wonder if the discussion is proceeding from mistaken premises.

Returning to ὃς αἰθέρα ἔκθορε πρῶτος in xiii 4, nothing in these remarks enables a decision between 'who first ejaculated the aither' and 'who first sprang from the aither'.³⁴ Both are possible, and agnosticism may be the wisest course; but the latter at least allows aither to be a primeval element (existing before Ouranos) as it is in other theogonies. It should be clear that xiv 1 offers less support to Burkert's view than is commonly thought.

I close with some remarks on the sequence of thought in column xiii. If the underlying myth is as suggested above, there is no penis for Zeus to swallow later, because it has become the sun. Therefore αἰδοῖον in xiii 4, on this hypothesis, would have to mean 'reverend'.³⁵ Yet the commentator clearly takes it to mean 'phallus' (note the switch from plural αἰδοίων to singular αἰδοίῳ in xiii 9; the singular is a quotation from the verse).³⁶ How is this possible? The subject of xiii 4 is Zeus, given that he is mentioned in xiii 1, and given that κατέπινε points to the swallowing of earlier creation familiar from later texts (see *OF* 260 Bernabé).³⁷ The swallowing marks the beginning of the second stage of cosmic history, the recreation; but the castration happened in the first stage, and it is during that stage that Kronos acquired his name. One supposes, therefore, that in xiii 5 ff. the commentator is reverting to an earlier stage of the story in order to make his point.³⁸ He must explain the significance of Zeus

³⁴ I agree with Scermino 2011, 67 that a translation 'sprang into the aither', understanding αἰθέρα as accusative of direction, would require εἰσθορε. Kotwick, *per litt.*, suggests, however, that ἐκ- may govern a genitive in a previous, lost verse (e.g. φῶς, as in *OF* 121), in which case αἰθέρα might be the destination (cf. *OF* 126). One hesitates to amend away the unusual hiatus; Sider 2014, 242 suggests that it is deliberately used to produce a vivid effect. In the translation 'first ejaculated the aither', 'first' is not otiose, as has been objected (Betegh 2004, 155); it is a version of the πρῶτος εὐρετής idiom.

³⁵ See Betegh 2004, 111–122 and KPT for principal arguments for and against the translations 'phallus' vs. 'reverend'. More recently, Ferrari 2013, 60 notes that the word-order [e.g. Οὐρανοῦ Εὐφρονίδαο] / αἰδοῖον κατέπινεν ὃς αἰθέρα ἔκθορε πρῶτος, in which the relative pronoun refers not to the nearest noun but to the one before it at the end of the preceding verse, is 'not easy to parallel' in archaic epic; Sider 2014, 241 notes that if αἰδοῖον means 'phallus' in the poem, it should be in the plural.

³⁶ Sider 2014, 241.

³⁷ The subject cannot be Kronos. xiii 4 needs to describe Zeus's action in the second stage of creation, which the commentator explains by digressing back to the first. He warns his reader in xiii 5–6 that this will take some time. Note the parallels not only of κατέπινε with *OF* 240 Bernabé but of xvi 3 ff. with *OF* 241.

³⁸ See e.g. Betegh 2004, 108–131; Bernabé 2007c, 110–114.

swallowing Ouranos (or Protogonos),³⁹ which in turn will show that Zeus did not, as the surface meaning of the poem suggests, need to be instructed on this occasion (τότε, xiii 2), since the plan of Nous (who is Zeus) was there from the beginning. The phallus of Ouranos is critical to this explanation, because its severance was the ‘great deed’ that produced the sun, enabling the first stage of creation. Only in the wake of that could Zeus’ action take place. The commentator (surely) understood that Zeus swallowed the whole reverend god. Even if αἰδοῖον had not been in his text, he would still have needed to explain how this second action replicated the first stage, because of what Kronos, ὁ κρούων Νοῦς, did; he would have wished to spell out the allegorical meaning of the succession of Ouranos, Kronos and Zeus. That involved explaining about the phallus and the sun. αἰδοῖον *was*, however, in his text: imagine his allegorist’s delight at the serendipity of the poet using this ambiguous word.⁴⁰ Literally, it means ‘reverend’; but in the overall context of the allegory, it also means ‘phallus’. To understand these mystical texts, one has to take them line by line, if not word by word (xiii 6).⁴¹

Bibliography

- Beckman, G., 2011. Primordial Obstetrics: ‘The Song of Emergence’ (CTH 344), in M. Hutter and S. Hutter-Braunsar (eds.), *Hethitische Literatur. Überlieferungsprozesse, Textstrukturen, Ausdrucksformen und Nachwirken*. Akten des Symposiums vom 18. bis 20. Februar 2010 in Bonn (AOAT 391), Münster, 25–33.
- Bernabé, A., 2002. La théogonie orphique du papyrus de Derveni. *Kernos* 15: 91–129.
- Bernabé, A., 2007a. *Poetae Epici Graeci. Testimonia et Fragmenta. Pars II Fasciculus 3. Musaeus, Linus, Epimenides, Papyrus Derveni, Indices*. Berlin and New York.
- Bernabé, A., 2007b. Autour de l’interprétation des colonnes XIII–XVI du papyrus du Derveni. *Rhizai* 4: 77–103.
- Bernabé, A., 2007c. The Derveni Theogony: Many Questions and Some Answers. *HSCP* 103: 99–133.
- Bernabé, A., 2008. Teogonías Órficas, in Bernabé and Casadesús 2008, I 291–324.
- Bernabé, A., 2010. El *Himno a Zeus Órfico*. Vicisitudes literarias, ideológicas y religiosas, in F. Casadesús and M.A. Santamaría (eds.), *Orfeo y orfismo: nuevas perspectivas*, Alicante, 67–97. Available online at www.cervantesvirtual.com/obra/orfeo-y-el-orfismo-nuevas-perspectivas--0/.
- Bernabé, A., and Casadesús, F. (eds.), 2008. *Orfeo y la tradición órfica. Un reencuentro*. 2 vols., Madrid.
- Betegh, G., 2004. *The Derveni Papyrus. Cosmology, Theology and Interpretation*. Cambridge.
- Betegh, G., 2011. The ‘Great Tablet’ from Thurii (OF 492), in Herrero de Jáuregui *et al.* 2011, 219–225.
- Brisson, L., 2003. Sky, Sex and Sun. The meanings of αἰδοῖος / αἰδοῖον in the Derveni papyrus. *ZPE* 144: 19–29.

³⁹ I agree with Betegh 2004, 118–119 that Phanes/Protogonos was not in the Derveni theogony, but the point is not germane to my argument here.

⁴⁰ Cf. Edwards 1991, 205–206.

⁴¹ Cf. Santamaría 2012, 63–64.

- Burkert, W., 1979. Von Ullikummi zum Kaukasus: Die Felsgeburt des Unholds. *WJA* n.F. 5: 253–261.
- , 1987. Oriental and Greek Mythology: The Meeting of Parallels, in J. Bremmer (ed.), *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, London–Sydney, 10–40.
- , 1999. *Da Omero ai Magi. La tradizione orientale nella cultura greca*. Venice.
- , 2003. *Kleine Schriften II: Orientalia*, ed. M.L. Gemelli Marciano, Göttingen.
- , 2005. La teogonia originale di Orfeo secondo il Papiro di Derveni, in G. Guidorizzi and M. Melotti (eds.), *Orfeo e le sue metamorfosi*, Rome, 46–64.
- , 2006. Die altorphanische Theogonie nach dem Papyrus von Derveni, in W. Burkert, *Kleine Schriften III: Mystica, Orphica, Pythagorica*, ed. F. Graf, Göttingen, 95–111.
- Calame, C., 2008. El discurso órfico: prácticas de escritura oral, in Bernabé and Casadesús 2008, I 841–866.
- Casadesús Bordoy, F. 2011. The Castration of Uranus and its Physical Consequences in the Derveni Papyrus (cols. XIII and XIV) and the First Stoic Philosophers, in Herrero de Jáuregui *et al.* 2011, 377–383.
- Edwards, M.J., 1991. Notes on the Derveni Commentator. *ZPE* 86: 203–211.
- Ferella, C., 2008. Il papiro di Derveni e le teogonie orfiche, *SCO* 54: 187–212.
- Ferrari, F., 2013. Solar Issues in the Derveni Papyrus, *ZPE* 186: 57–75.
- Güterbock, H.G., 1948. The Hittite Version of the Hurrian Kumarbi Myths: Oriental Forerunners of Hesiod. *AJA* 52: 123–134.
- , 1951. The Song of Ullikummi. Revised Text of the Hittite Version of a Hurrian Myth. *JCS* 5: 135–161.
- Herrero de Jáuregui, M., Jiménez San Cristóbal, A.I., Luján Martínez, E. R., Martín Hernández, R., Santamaría Álvarez, M. A., and Torallas Tovar, S. (eds.), 2011. *Tracing Orpheus. Studies of Orphic Fragments in Honour of Alberto Bernabé*. Berlin and Boston.
- Janko, R., 2001. The Derveni Papyrus (Diagoras of Melos, Apopyrgizontes Logoi?): A New Translation, *CPh* 96: 1–32.
- , 2002. The Derveni Papyrus: An Interim Text. *ZPE* 141: 1–62.
- Kouremenos, T., Parássoglou, G.M., and Tsantsanoglou, K. (eds.), 2006. *The Derveni Papyrus*. Florence (‘KPT’).
- Rusten, J.S., 1985. Interim Notes on the Papyrus from Derveni. *HSCP* 89: 121–140.
- Santamaría, M.A., 2012. Critical Notes to the Orphic Poem of the Derveni Papyrus, *ZPE* 182: 55–76.
- Scermino, M., 2011. P. Derveni coll. XIII–XVI: un mito, due frammenti, un rompicapo, in *Papiri Filosofici. Miscellanea di Studi*, VI, Studi e testi per il corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini, Florence, 55–90.
- Schröder, S., 2007. Pap. Derv. col. XVI 1, *ZPE* 161: 27–28.
- Sider, D., 2014. The Orphic Poem of the Derveni Papyrus, in I. Papadopoulou and L. Muellner (eds.), *Poetry as Initiation*. The Center for Hellenic Studies Symposium on the Derveni Papyrus, Cambridge, MA and London, 225–253.
- West, M.L., 1983. *The Orphic Poems*. Oxford.
- , 1997. *The East Face of Helicon*. Oxford.
- , 2013. *Hellenica*. Selected Papers on Greek Literature and Thought. Volume III: Philosophy, Music and Metre, Literary Byways, Varia. Oxford.

Robert L. Fowler – Department of Classics and Ancient History, University of Bristol, 11
Woodland Road, Bristol BS8 1TB, United Kingdom.
robert.fowler@bristol.ac.uk